



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,202	10/13/2005	Johannes Boppel	W1.2106 PCT-US	1270

7590 07/14/2008  
Douglas R Hanscom  
Jones Tullar & Cooper  
Eads Station  
PO Box 2266  
Arlington, VA 22202

EXAMINER
----------

BANH, DAVID H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2854

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/14/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/553,202	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BOPPEL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> DAVID BANH	<b>Art Unit</b> 2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/19/2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 25,36,41-43 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 25,36 and 41-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 25, 36 and 41-43 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 25 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmatier (US Patent 6,827,012) in view of Ueyama et al. (US PG Pub 2004/0108403) and Delwiche et al. (US Patent 6,220,157).

For claim 25: Palmatier teaches first and second unreeling devices adapted to unwind previously rewound webs of material (column 5, lines 40-45, **22**, **23** and **24**), a longitudinal web cutting device (column 7, lines 10-20, **515** and **516**), a former (column 6, lines 49-52, **302**), a folder (column 6, line 44-46, **30**) and a transverse cutting device (column 6, lines 50-55, **308**).

Palmatier does not teach an electric drive mechanism for the unreeling devices, a control device for controlling the electric drive mechanism, a draw-in unit or a turning bar. However, Ueyama et al. teaches an electric drive mechanism for the unreeling devices (paragraph 17, Figure 1), a control device for the electric drive (paragraph 18, unwinding motor **M0** and unwinding shaft) and a draw-in unit (paragraph 4, takeoff-rollers **20** and **30**). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the drive and drive

controls of Ueyama et al. with the unwinding apparatus of Palmatier because the unreeling devices of Palmatier need to be driven by motors and to combine the draw-in unit for maintaining web tension and movement.

The combination of Palmatier and Ueyama et al. does not teach a turning bar arrangement located after the cutting device. However, Delwiche et al. teaches a turning bar (column 5, lines 5-15, **79** and **80**, Figure 4) for turning the web. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a turning bar as taught by Delwiche et al. in a web unwinding apparatus for the purpose of being able to change the web direction as needed.

For claim 36: Palmatier also teaches that a former (column 6, lines 49-52, **302**, figure 3) is centered on a unwound previously rewound web and a second former (column 5, lines 7-15, **500**, Figure 5) is centered on a web cut by the longitudinal cutting device.

4. Claims 41 and 42 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmatier (US Patent 6,827,012), Ueyama et al. (US PG Pub 2004/0108403) and Delwiche et al. (US Patent 6,220,157) as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of Izawa (US Patent 6,821,038).

For claim 41: The combination of Palmatier, Ueyama et al. and Delwiche et al. teaches all of the limitations of claim 41 as found in claim 25 above. The combination does not teach the printing press is a 16 page printing press. However, Izawa teaches a 16 page printing press (column 1, lines 48-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the combination of Palmatier, Ueyama et al. and Delwiche et al. in a printing press for producing 16-page documents as many newsprint publications are near this size.

For claim 42: Izawa also teaches the production of a 32-page product (column 1, lines 48-55).

5. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Palmatier (US Patent 6,827,012), Ueyama et al. (US PG Pub 2004/0108403) and Delwiche et al. (US Patent 6,220,157) as applied to claim 25 above, and further in view of Bialek (US PG Pub 2002/0046666).

The combination of Palmatier, Ueyama et al. and Delwiche et al. teaches all of the limitations of claim 43 as found in claim 25 above. The combination does not teach the printing press is a jobbing printing press. However, Bialek teaches a folding device that can be a jobbing printing press (paragraph 30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the combination of Palmatier, Ueyama et al. and Delwiche et al. in a jobbing printing press for unwinding, folding and slitting webs.

### ***Conclusion***

6. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID BANH whose telephone number is (571)270-3851. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 9:30AM-8PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571)272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DHB  
July 10, 2008

/Daniel J. Colilla/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2854